

Ms. Wendy R. Dixon, EIS Program Manager  
M/S 010  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office  
PO Box 30307  
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

2/22/2000

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2000

Dear Ms. Dixon,

I took the opportunity to learn more about what the DOE is planing for Yucca Mountain and probably for the future of Southern Nevada (and the surrounding area), at your public hearing held in Pahrump earlier this year.

Your plan is impractical at best (at least through my eyes).

- 1 [You're speaking of storing 77,000 metric tons of waste in the mountain.

Well, what is a metric ton? One metric ton is 2,200 lbs. So, then, 77,000 metric tons are 169,400,000 lbs.

How do we visualize what kind of volume we're speaking of, and how impractical this project really is?

Most of us drive cars, so let's use them as our example. Let's say for the sake of argument, they weigh 3,500 lbs. each. If I've done the math right, we are looking at trying to park 4,840,000 cars inside Yucca Mountain. Will they fit? Probably not!

- 2 That is the storage problem, what about transportation? [You've got to get the waste to the site from all over the country, Maine to Florida, California to Washington. Got to get here some way (passing through 43 states I'm told).

Right now, looks like your best plan is by truck. Rather impractical if you ask me. You are so vague about the use of rail, I don't know how heavily this aspect has been studied?

You at least know, you will have to build some rail lines (one would go right through Pahrump, if-you-were-to use the Jean Corridor). If this were the case, how many train loads of Nuclear Garbage would come through our town?

I don't know enough about trains to make a comment, but I'll bet, it'll be more than one!

- 3 [All things being equal, let's say you decide the use of trucks are the best bet for transporting this garbage. What are we speaking of here? Let's speak only of what you refer to as "Light Haul" trucks. Most of us would recognize these as what are commonly referred to as 18 wheelers. So, let's use them for our example. And let's use 40,000 lbs. per load. I seem to remember this weight as being a "legal weight" in most states. We

3 cont. wont even speak of what you refer to as "Heavy Haul" trucks. That'll scare most folks right out of their skin!

OK, we've got 77,000 metric tons of garbage to move. Remember a metric ton is 2200 lbs., so we are to move 169,000,000 lbs. of waste to Yucca Mountain. 40,000 lbs. per load (bulk, not counting the weight of the canisters), dose that come out to 4,840,000 truck loads? Even more, if you count the weight of the canisters!

I'm not all that good at math, but it did when I divided it.

I'm sure we, the residents of the State of Nevada (as well as other states), would really appreciate the extra traffic, not to speak of the extra wear and tear on our roads!

4 One last thing, what ever happened to the State Law passed in 1980's, forbidding the transportation of Nuclear material within the state?

Is this Screw You Nevada all over again?

And two final questions.

- 5 1. What about the second site at Yucca Mountain mentioned in your report? No one seems to mention this possibility for further contamination of our state and the surrounding area (Arizona, California and Mexico for example).
- 6 2. Will the DOE be responsible for any and all accidents caused while transporting the Nuclear waste to our area? I'm sure 43 states governments would be interested in this aspect of your plan, not to mention the motorist who will come in contact with the transportation of these materials along the chosen routes crisscrossing our nation.

Just a couple of thoughts to contemplate on your coffee break as you plan the future (or demise) of the State of Nevada and it's citizens.

Regards,



Rod Penner

2321 W. Manitoba  
Pahrump, NV 89048